

#### REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the subject application in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Claims 1-20 are pending in the application, with claims 1, 11, and 16 being independent. Claims 1, 4, 7, 9-16 and 18-20 are amended herein. Support for the claim amendments and additions can be found in the original disclosure. No new matter has been added.

#### § 103 REJECTIONS

Claims 1-6, and 8-10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over “Analyzing Website privacy requirements using a privacy goal taxonomy” (“Anton”) in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0188572 (“Bleizeffer”).

Claim 7 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anton in view of www.w3schools.com (“W3Schools”).

Claims 11-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bleizeffer in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0084300 (“Koike”).

Applicant respectfully traverses the aforementioned rejections, and further requests that the rejections be reconsidered and withdrawn for at least the reasons that follow.

**Independent claim 1**, as presently presented, recites:

A method, comprising:  
comparing one or more user concerns with a Web site privacy policy;  
identifying specific portions of the Web site privacy policy that conflict with the user concerns;  
re-ordering the Web site privacy policy such that the identified specific portions of the Web site privacy policy that conflict with the user concerns appear before the portions of the Web site privacy policy that do not conflict with the user concerns ; and  
displaying the re-ordered Web site privacy policy.

Anton is directed to a taxonomy for classifying privacy goals to “enable requirements engineers and analysts to build security and privacy into e-commerce applications early on rather than having to add it in afterwards due to oversight or external pressures.” (Summary and Future Work).

Bleizeffer is directed to “an interface for creating privacy policies for the platform for privacy preferences specification.” (Background). Specifically, “the policy editor of the present invention focuses on letting the user group, manipulate, and describe the data the Web site uses.” (Paragraph [0038]).

Applicant respectfully submits that Anton and Bleizeffer whether taken alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest the recitations of claim 1 as is required by MPEP 2143 to establish a prima facie case of obviousness. Specifically, Anton in view of Bleizeffer fails to disclose or suggest “re-ordering the Web site privacy policy such that the identified specific portions of the Web site privacy policy that conflict with the user concerns appear before the portions of the Web site privacy policy that do not conflict with the user concerns” as recited in claim 1. The Office recites with reference to claim 1:

Anton fails to disclose displaying the transformed Web site privacy policy so that the emphasized portions of the Web site privacy policy are demarcated from other portions of the Web site privacy policy. Bleizeffer teaches and interface that displays privacy policy preferences specifications (paragraph [0006-0007] interface displays descriptions of the privacy policy in several forms]; see also, paragraph [0003 screen that displays the main policy editor window]).

(Office Action, page 3, lines 1-6).

Applicant agrees with the Office that Anton does not explicitly disclose or suggest “displaying the transformed Web site privacy policy so that the emphasized portions of the Web site privacy policy are demarcated from other portions of the Web site privacy policy”; however, Applicant respectfully traverses the assertion that Bleizeffer teaches “re-ordering the Web site privacy policy such that the identified specific portions of the Web site privacy policy that conflict with the user concerns appear before the portions of the Web site privacy policy that do not conflict with the user concerns”.

Applicant provides the relevant section of Bleizeffer that was cited by the Office. Specifically, paragraph [0007] discusses the graphical user interface of Bleizeffer as follows: “A policy portion of the interface displays descriptions of the policy in several forms. Statements in the policy are formed from the groups in the groups portion of the interface.” (Paragraph [0007]). The policy portion of Bleizeffer is further described in paragraph [0040] as follows:

The policy pane is used to display descriptions of the policy in several forms. First, a table of all data elements listed in the policy is given. Second, a hypertext markup language (HTML) version of the policy is shown. Third, the formal extensible markup language (XML) version of the policy is available. A compact policy is also displayed. A compact policy is a summary of what the policy says about the Web site's cookies. Lastly, any errors or warnings that apply to this policy are displayed.

(Paragraph [0040]). As stated in the above cited portion of Bleizeffer, “display descriptions of the policy in several forms”, includes displaying “a hypertext markup language (HTML) version of the policy”, a “formal extensible markup language (XML) version of the policy”, a “summary of what the policy says about the Web site's cookies”, and any “errors or warnings that apply to this policy.” Since the order of the policy is maintained when Bleizeffer either displays the policy in a different language or in a condensed form, Bleizeffer, fails to disclose or suggest “re-ordering the Web site privacy policy” as recited in claim 1.

Furthermore, even if only portions of the policy are displayed when Bleizeffer displays the policy in a condensed form, Bleizeffer is silent as to “re-ordering the Web site privacy policy” as recited in claim 1. In addition, there is no motivation to combine the Anton and Bleizeffer references. Accordingly, independent claim 1 is believed to be allowable.

**Dependent claims 2-6, and 8-10** depend from independent claim 1 and are allowable by virtue of this dependency, as well as for additional features that they recite. In addition, there is no motivation to combine the Anton and Bleizeffer references. Applicant also respectfully requests individual consideration of each dependent claim.

**Dependent claim 7** depends from independent claim 1 and is allowable by virtue of this dependency, as well as for additional features that it recites. In addition, there is no motivation to combine the Anton and W3Schools references. Applicant also respectfully requests individual consideration of each dependent claim.

**Independent claim 11**, as presently presented, recites:

A system, comprising:  
a user concerns menu to allow a user to enter user concerns that are privacy concern preferences applicable to browsing Web sites;  
a Web browser to allow the user to access one or more network Web sites;  
a trust engine to:  
compare the user concerns with a privacy policy file included in a Web site, and  
identify specific portions of the privacy policy file that conflict with the user concerns;  
a transformation module to transform the privacy policy file into a user-centric policy display that emphasizes the specific portions of the privacy policy file that conflict with the user concerns; and  
a user interface module to display a user interface that includes at least the specific portions of the privacy policy file that conflict with the user concerns.

(Emphasis added). Koike is directed to “A system for administrating data including privacy of a user in communication made between a server and a terminal device of the user.” (Abstract). Specifically, a “privacy data administrator compares a privacy policy made by the server and a privacy preference determined by the user to each other.” (Abstract).

Applicant respectfully submits that Bleizeffer and Koike, whether taken alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest the recitations of claim 11 as is required by MPEP 2143 to establish a prima facie case of obviousness. Specifically, Bleizeffer in view of Koike fails to disclose or suggest “identify specific portions of the privacy policy file that conflict with the user concerns” as recited in claim 11. Instead, as described further below, Bleizeffer in view of Koike provides simply judging whether a privacy policy is acceptable to a user of a terminal device. The Office recites with reference to claim 11:

Bleizeffer does not disclose a trust engine configured to compare the user concerns with a privacy policy file included in a Web site and to identify conflicts between the user concerns and the privacy policy file. Koike teaches a comparator that compares the privacy policy to privacy preferences and judges whether the privacy policy is consistent with the privacy policy (paragraphs [0090, 0095, 0166-comparator 104 compares the privacy policy).

(Office Action, page 6, lines 12-17).

Applicant agrees with the Office that Bleizeffer does not explicitly disclose or suggest “a trust engine configured to compare the user concerns with a privacy policy file included in a Web site”; however, Applicant respectfully traverses the assertion that Koike teaches “identify specific portions of the privacy policy file that conflict with the user concerns” as recited in claim 11.

Applicant provides the relevant section of Koike that was cited by the Office. Specifically, Koike recites: “a comparator 104 which compares the privacy policy 103 received at the policy receiver 103, to the privacy preference 50, and judges whether the privacy policy 30 is consistent with the privacy preference 50.” (Paragraph [0090]). Thus, Koike simply compares the privacy policy with privacy preference to determine whether the privacy policy is consistent with the privacy preferences. However, Koike is silent as to “*identify specific portions* of the privacy policy file that conflict with the user concerns.” (Emphasis added). Determining whether a privacy policy is consistent with the privacy preferences, as disclosed in Koike, fails to teach identifying “specific portions of the privacy policy file that conflict” as recited in claim 11.

In addition, there is no motivation to combine the Bleizeffer and Koike references. Accordingly, independent claim 11 is allowable.

**Dependent claims 12-15** depend from independent claim 11 and are allowable by virtue of this dependency, as well as for additional features that they recite. In addition, there is no motivation to combine the Bleizeffer and Koike references. Applicant also respectfully requests individual consideration of each dependent claim.

**Independent claim 16**, as presently presented, recites:

One or more computer-readable media including computer-executable instructions that, when executed on a computer, perform a method of evaluating computer-based privacy policies comprising:

comparing a set of user concerns with a set of Web site privacy policy statements to determine if a privacy policy statement conflicts with a user concern;

identifying specific portions of the privacy policy statement that conflict with the user concern;

re-ordering the privacy policy statements so that the specific portions of the privacy policy statement that conflict with the user concern appear before the portions of the privacy policy statement that do not conflict with the user concern; and

displaying a user interface that presents the re-ordered privacy policy statements.

Applicant respectfully submits that Bleizeffer either singly or in view of Koike fails to disclose or suggest the recitations of claim 16 for at least two reasons.

First, Bleizeffer either singly or in view of Koike fails to disclose or suggest "identifying specific portions of the privacy policy statement that conflict with the user concern." The Office recites with reference to claim 16:

Bleizeffer does not disclose comparing a set of user concerns with a set of Web site privacy policy statements to determine if a privacy policy statement conflicts with a user concern. Koike teaches a recording medium storing a computer program capable of executing a user terminal device to output a warning to a user and compare the received privacy policy to privacy preferences (paragraph [0179—183

recording medium storing the program]; see also, paragraph [0010, 0013-user terminal device]).

(Office Action, page 8, lines 7-13).

Applicant agrees with the Office that Bleizeffer does not explicitly disclose or suggest “comparing a set of user concerns with a set of Web site privacy policy statements to determine if a privacy policy statement conflicts with a user concern”; however, Applicant respectfully traverses the assertion that Koike teaches “identifying specific portions of the privacy policy statement that conflict with the user concern” as recited in claim 16.

Applicant incorporates similar reasoning as presented above in response to the rejection of claim 11. Specifically, Bleizeffer in view of Koike provides simply judging whether a privacy policy is acceptable to a user of a terminal device. However, Bleizeffer in view of Koike is silent as to “*identifying specific portions of the privacy policy statement that conflict with the user concern.*” (Emphasis added). Specifically, judging whether a privacy policy is consistent with the privacy preferences, as disclosed in Koike, fails to teach identifying “specific portions of the privacy policy statement that conflict with the user concern” as recited in claim 16.

Second, Bleizeffer either singly or in view of Koike fails to disclose or suggest “re-ordering the privacy policy statements so that the specific portions of the privacy policy statement that conflict with the user concern appear before the portions of the privacy policy statement that do not conflict with the user concern.” Applicant incorporates similar reasoning as presented above in response to the rejection of claim 1. Specifically, although Bleizeffer displays the different forms of the policy, the order of the privacy

policy is not altered and thus Bleizeffer fails to disclose or suggest “re-ordering the privacy policy statements so that the specific portions of the privacy policy statement that conflict with the user concern appear before the portions of the privacy policy statement that do not conflict with the user concern” as recited in claim 16.

In addition, there is no motivation to combine the Bleizeffer and Koike references. Accordingly independent claim 16 is believed allowable.

**Dependent claims 17-20** depend from independent claim 16 and are allowable by virtue of this dependency, as well as for additional features that they recite. In addition, there is no motivation to combine the Bleizeffer and Koike references. Applicant also respectfully requests individual consideration of each dependent claim.

CONCLUSION

For at least the foregoing reasons, claims 1-20 are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections and an early notice of allowance.

The arguments and amendments presented herein were necessitated by the most recent Office Action.

If any issue remains unresolved that would prevent allowance of this case, Applicant requests that the Examiner contact the undersigned attorney to resolve the issue.

Respectfully Submitted,

Lee & Hayes, PLLC

Dated: 2008-08-29

By: /Damon J. Kruger/

Damon J. Kruger  
Reg No. 60400  
206-315-7918